

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Status of the Application

Claims 8-15, 17, 20-29 and 32-39 are currently pending. Of these, claims 8, 11, 15, 17, 20-22, 24, 28, 29 are amended in order to clarify the subject matter Applicants claim as their invention, while claims 36-39 are new. As all of the amended and new claims are supported by the application (including the claims) as originally filed, no new matter has been introduced into the application by way of these amendments.

Summary of the Office Action

The Office Action rejects claims 15, 17, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,994,496 ("Van Haare et al.")

Discussion

The Office Action asserts that Van Haare et al. anticipates the claims by disclosing layers of conjugated polymers that may be used as a transparent coating on a display device or as an electrode layer in an electroluminescent device, citing column 1, lines 5-12, in support thereof:

The invention relates to a conjugated polymer in an oxidized state and a method of preparing such a conjugated polymer.

The invention further relates to a substrate surface, in particular a surface of a display screen of a display device, provided with a layer comprising such a conjugated polymer.

The invention also relates to an electrode comprising such a conjugated polymer, and in particular to an electroluminescent device comprising such an electrode.).

The Office Action also asserts that Van Haare et al. discloses 3,4-di(2-methylbutoxy)-2,5-thiophene as a preferred polymer, citing column 3, lines 22-31, in support thereof:

Preferred polythiophenes are soluble (di)alkyl and (di)alkoxypolythiophenes. Examples include poly(3-octyl-2,5-thiophene) and poly(3,4-di(2-methylbutoxy)-2,5-thiophene) which are soluble in common organic solvents in both the undoped and doped state. For similar reasons, 2,5-substituted poly-1,4-phenylenevinylenes are preferred, in particular poly(2-(3,7-dimethyloctyloxy)-5-methoxy-1,4-phenylenevinylene), whereas a suitable polythiophylenevinylene is poly(3,4-di(2-methylbutoxy)-2,5-thiophylenevinylene).

In addition, the Office Action advises that column 5, lines 27-37, of Van Haare et al. discloses that at least one electrode (which can include both electrodes) has a transparent coating using a preferred polythiophene such as 3,4-di(2-methylbutoxy)-2,5-thiophene solution. An exemplary embodiment is said to disclose a 3,4-dialkoxythiophene wherein the two alkoxy groups are represented by OR¹ and OR² wherein R¹ and R² are C1-C4 alkyl(butoxy) with a methyl group as a substituent on the alkyl chain.

Applicants assert that the only polymer of a 3,4-dialkoxy-thiophene identified in Van Haare et al. is poly[3,4-di(2-methylbutoxy)-2,5-thiophene], a polymer in which thiophene is substituted in the 3- and 4-positions with a 2-methylbutoxy group which has 5 carbon atoms. In contrast, new claims 37, 38 and 39 each requires, *inter alia*, a polymer or copolymer of a 3,4-dialkoxy-thiophene, which may be the same or different, in which said two alkoxy groups are represented by –OR¹ and –OR² where each of R¹ and R² independently represents a C1-C4 alkyl group.

Moreover, claims 17, 20 and 21, which require, *inter alia*, a polymer or copolymer of a 3,4-dialkoxy-thiophene, which may be the same or different, in which said two alkoxy groups together represent an optionally substituted C1-C4 alkylene group or a cycloalkylene group are not disclosed by Van Haare et al.

Claim 15 (and others, e.g., claim 36) further describe a process for providing an illuminated poster or signage which comprises, *inter alia*, an electroluminescent device as described in the claim. The subject matter of these claims is not disclosed or taught by Van Haare et al.

Finally, new claim 36 requires, *inter alia*, said first and second electrodes to each comprise a polymer or copolymer of a 3,4-dialkoxythiophene, which may be the same or different, in which said two alkoxy groups together represent an optionally substituted oxy-alkylene-oxy bridge. The claimed subject matter is not disclosed or taught by Van Haare et al.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Van Haare et al. fails to disclose (or teach) the subject matter described in claims 15, 17, 20 and 21, and request that the anticipation rejection over Va Haare et al. be withdrawn.

Conclusion

As Applicants believe the application is in proper condition for allowance, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass the application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher T. Griffith/

Christopher T. Griffith, Reg. No. 33,392
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: February 2, 2007